arXiv:1212.4055v1 [hep-ph] 17 Dec 2012

Masses and Mixing Matrices of Quarks Within the *Spin-Charge-Family* Theory

G. Bregar, N.S. Mankoč Borštnik

Department of Physics, FMF, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

The *spin-charge-family* theory [1–4] predicts the number of families. There are four massless families of quarks and leptons before the electroweak break. There are two kinds of charges in this theory, connected with two kinds of the Clifford objects. The Dirac like kind explains the spin and the *standard model* charges, the second kind explains the existence of families. Correspondingly there are two kinds of scalar fields, determining masses of vector bosons and mass matrices of fermions. The first kind distinguishes only among family members, the second kind only among families. Mass matrices exhibit correspondingly very particular symmetries. In this contribution we take matrix elements as free parameters, which we determine by requiring that mass matrices keep by the *spin-charge-family* theory determined symmetries and that properties of fermions agree with the experimental data. Very preliminary results show that matrix elements of one of the two quark mass matrices are surprisingly close (within a factor of less then 2) to one another, while of the rest mass matrix do not differ more than for an order of magnitude.

I. INTRODUCTION

The *spin-charge-family* theory [1–4] is offering the explanation for the origin of families, predicting four massless families before the electroweak break. Correspondingly does the theory explain the origin of scalar fields which at low energies manifest as the observed Higgs and the Yukawa couplings. As a kind of the Kaluza-Klein like theories this theory unifies spin and charges into only the spin in higher than $d = (1 + 3)$ dimensional space, offering a possible answer to the question about the origin of the so far observed charges and correspondingly also about the so far observed gauge fields.

In this theory all the properties of fermions and bosons in the low energy regime originate in a simple starting action for massless fields [11]. Fermions, coupled to the vielbeins and the two kinds of the spin connection fields, manifest after several breaks of the starting symmetries before the electroweak break four massless families of quarks and leptons, left weak charged and right weak chargeless. The vielbeins and the two kinds of the spin connection fields manifest effectively as the observed gauge fields and (those with the scalar indices in $d = (1+3)$) as several scalar fields. The mass matrices of the four family members (quarks and leptons) are after the electroweak break

I_i	1	2	3	4
1	$-\frac{1}{2}\,(\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}3}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L 3}_{\mp}) - \tilde{a}^{\tilde{4}}_{\mp} + a^{\alpha}_{\mp}$ $+\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}$
2	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp}$	$\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}3}_{\mp} - \tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L 3}_{\mp}) - \tilde{a}^{\tilde{4}}_{\mp} + a^{\alpha}_{\mp}$ $+\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp}\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp}\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}$
3	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}$	$\frac{1}{2}\,(-\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}3}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L 3}_{\mp}) - \tilde{a}^{\tilde{4}}_{\mp} + a^{\alpha}_{\mp}$ $+\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp}\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp}$
4	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}^+_L}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}$	$\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp}$	$\frac{1}{2}\,(\tilde{a}^{13}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L 3}_{\mp}) - \tilde{a}^{\tilde{4}}_{\mp} + a^{\alpha}_{\mp}$ $+\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L -}_{\mp}\,\tilde{a}^{\tilde{N}_L +}_{\mp} + \tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}+}_{\mp}\tilde{a}^{\tilde{1}-}_{\mp}$

TABLE I: The mass matrices on the tree level for the (lowest) four families of quarks and leptons after the electroweak break. The contributions of the scalar fields $\tilde{A}^{\tilde{A}i}_s$, $\tilde{A}^{\tilde{A}i}_{\mp} = \tilde{A}^{\tilde{A}i}_7 \pm i\,\tilde{A}^{\tilde{A}i}_8$, for $\tilde{A} \in \{\tilde{N}_L, \tilde{1}, \tilde{4}\}$, and $A^{A}_s, = A^{A}_7 \pm i\,A^{A}_8$, for $A \in \{Q, Q', Y'\}$, are presented. ($\mp$) distinguishes between the values of the u-quarks ($-$) and d-quarks ($+$), and between the values of ν ($-$) and e ($+$) leptons. The contributions from the scalar fields A^{Ai}_s are the same for all the families, but different for different family members. $\tilde{A}^{\tilde{4}}_s$ contribute the same value for all the families and family members.

expressible on a tree level by the vacuum expectation values of the two kinds of the spin connection fields and the corresponding vielbeins with the scalar indices [12].

Due to this theory no super symmetric partners to the so far observed fields are expected.

In this paper we allow loop corrections in all orders under the assumption that they keep symmetries of mass matrices unchanged. We take the matrix elements as free parameters determining them so that properties of fermions are in agreement with the experimental data.

The mass matrices which follow from the *spin-charge-family* theory are presented in Table I and might not be Hermitian. To evaluate mass matrices on the tree level is a very demanding work [2, 3, 9]. Contributions of loop corrections [3, 6] are expected to be non perturbative and were so far estimated [6] for only up to the first order. Accordingly mass matrices with loop corrections in all orders are not known. They might even not be Hermitian. We simplify our study presented in this paper by assuming that they are symmetric up to signs – which depend on the choice of phases of basic states, as discussed in appendix A – and real. In the ref. [9] we made a similar assumption and got mass matrices and correspondingly mixing matrices for quarks in dependence on masses of the fourth family. This time we proceed in a different way in looking for the best fit for the experimental data than in the ref. [9]. The procedure, which we use in this paper, is as follows:

1. We assume that the mass matrix M^{α} is Hermitian, α stays for the family member. Then the diagonalizing unitary matrices S^{α} and T^{α}, introduced in appendix A as the two unitary matrices, which diagonalize a non Hermitian mass matrix, differ only in phase factors, which manifest phases of basic vectors, separately for the left handed and separately for the right handed basis: $T^{\alpha} = S^{\alpha}\, F^{\alpha\, S} F^{\alpha\, T\, \dagger}$, where $F^{\alpha\, S}$ and $F^{\alpha\, T}$ are two diagonal matrices, representing phases of the left handed and the right handed basis, correspondingly. We take the diagonal matrices M^{α}_{d} and the mixing matrices $V_{\alpha\beta}$, from the available experimental data. Properties of the fourth family members we take as free parameters, so that they do not contradict the experimental data.

   $$M^{\alpha} \;=\; S^{\alpha \dagger}\, \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{d}\, S^{\alpha}\,, \tag{1}$$

   One can proceed in two ways:

   $$\begin{aligned} &A.:\quad S^{\beta} = V^{\dagger}_{\alpha\beta}\, S^{\alpha}\,, &&B.:\quad S^{\alpha} = V_{\alpha\beta}\, S^{\beta}\,,\\ &A.:\quad S^{\alpha\dagger}\, V_{\alpha\beta}\, \mathbf{M}^{\beta}_{d}\, V^{\dagger}_{\alpha\beta}\, S^{\alpha} = M^{\beta}\,, &&B.:\quad S^{\beta\dagger}\, V^{\dagger}_{\alpha\beta}\, \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{d}\, V_{\alpha\beta}\, S^{\beta} = M^{\alpha}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

   In case $A.$ one obtains, when requiring that symmetries of M^{α} are kept (the first relation of the second line of Eq. (2)), the matrix S^{α}, from where we get M^{α} $(= S^{\alpha\dagger}\mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{d}\, S^{\alpha})$. In case $B.$ one obtains the matrix S^{β}, from where we get M^{β} $(= S^{\beta\dagger}\, \mathbf{M}^{\beta}_{d}\, S^{\beta})$.

2. We assume that loop corrections in all orders keep to a good accuracy the symmetry of the tree level mass matrices (as they follow from the theory) unchanged.

3. We simplify our study further by assuming that the mass matrix of Table I is real and can therefore be diagonalized with an orthogonal matrix S^{α} (see appendix A). The orthogonal $n \times n$ matrix has $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ free parameters, which is six for each pair of (α, β), that is for (u-quark and d-quark) and for (ν-lepton and e-lepton).

4. The mass matrix has, after taking into account all loop corrections, the same symmetry as the tree level mass matrix from Table I

   $$\mathcal{M}^{\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} -a_1 - a & e & d & b_1 \\ e & -a_2 - a & b_2 & d \\ d & b_2 & a_2 - a & e \\ b_1 & d & e & a_1 - a \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

By changing phases to basic vectors we can change signs to $2n-1$ matrix elements, while we need $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ phases to change relative signs of the diagonal matrix elements and the matrix elements of the upper triangle with respect to the lower one.

5. We express S^α with six angles

$$S^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \cos a^\alpha & -\sin a^\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ \sin a^\alpha & \cos a^\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos b^\alpha & -\sin b^\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \sin b^\alpha & \cos b^\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos c^\alpha & -\sin c^\alpha \\ 0 & 0 & \sin c^\alpha & \cos c^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \cdot \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos d^\alpha & 0 & -\sin d^\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \sin d^\alpha & 0 & \cos d^\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos e^\alpha & 0 & 0 & -\sin e^\alpha \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \sin e^\alpha & 0 & 0 & \cos e^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos f^\alpha & 0 & -\sin f^\alpha \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sin f^\alpha & 0 & \cos f^\alpha \end{pmatrix} . \tag{5}$$

6. We look for those twelve angles, which keep, up to signs, the symmetry of the mass matrices (3). Matrices are assumed to be real and accordingly symmetric up to signs. We therefore minimize the expression

$$\Bigg(\frac{1}{6} \sum_{\alpha=u,d} \bigg(\Big(\frac{|m^\alpha_{22} - m^\alpha_{11}| - |m^\alpha_{44} - m^\alpha_{33}|}{\frac{1}{2}\left(|m^\alpha_{22} - m^\alpha_{11}| + |m^\alpha_{44} - m^\alpha_{33}|\right)} \Big)^2$$

$$+ \Big(\frac{|m^\alpha_{12}| - |m^\alpha_{34}|}{\frac{1}{2}\left(|m^\alpha_{12}| + |m^\alpha_{34}|\right)} \Big)^2 + \Big(\frac{|m^\alpha_{13}| - |m^\alpha_{24}|}{\frac{1}{2}\left(|m^\alpha_{13}| + |m^\alpha_{24}|\right)} \Big)^2 \bigg) \Bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}} . \tag{6}$$

7. We expect several solutions in general, which all fulfil the above requirement about the symmetry of the mass matrices, about the masses and the mixing matrix. According to Eq.(1) we, namely, have for $G^\alpha G^{\alpha\dagger} = I$

$$M'^\alpha \;=\; S'^{\alpha\dagger}\, \mathbf{M}^\alpha_d\, S'^\alpha \,, \quad S'^\alpha = S^\alpha\, G^\alpha \,, \quad M'^\alpha = G^{\alpha\dagger}\, \mathbf{M}^\alpha\, G^\alpha \,, \tag{7}$$

provided that $G^\alpha G^{\beta\dagger} = I$. Then it follows

$$V_{\alpha\beta} \;=\; S'^\alpha\, S'^{\beta\dagger} = S^\alpha\, G^\alpha\, G^{\beta\dagger}\, S^{\beta\dagger} \,. \tag{8}$$

II. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this paper we study properties of only quarks. We take mixing matrix for three families of quarks from the experimental data [7], paying attention on the absolute values only, requiring correspondingly that the 4×4 matrix is orthogonal and real. We take for $V_{ud} = S^u S^{d\,\dagger}$ two possibilities, paying attention to the experimental accuracy. For the first possibility we take

$$V_{ud} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9742 & -0.2252 & -0.0042 & 0.0102 \\ 0.225 & 0.9734 & -0.0409 & -0.0165 \\ 0.0084 & 0.0429 & 0.8671 & 0.4961 \\ -0.012 & -0.0034 & -0.496 & 0.868 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

and for the second one we take

$$V_{ud} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9740 & -0.2243 & -0.0041 & 0.0306 \\ 0.2242 & 0.9737 & -0.0409 & -0.0049 \\ 0.0084 & 0.0403 & 0.986 & 0.1616 \\ -0.031 & -0.0052 & -0.162 & 0.9864 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

One can notice that the fourth family is stronger coupled to the lower three in the first choice than in the second one.

For masses of quarks we take the experimental data [7] at the energy scale of M_Z, while we take the fourth family masses as free parameters as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}^u_d/\mathrm{MeV/c^2} &= (1.3, 620, 172000, m^{u_4})\,, \\ \mathbf{M}^d_d/\mathrm{MeV/c^2} &= (2.9, 55, 2900, m^{d_4})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Following the procedure explained in section I we look for the mass matrices for the u-quarks and the d-quarks by minimizing the expression presented in Eq. (6), when taking into account the mixing matrix from Eq. (9) and the one from Eq. (10) and adding the masses from Eq. (11).

Minimization procedure works for most values of m^{u_4} and m^{d_4} efficiently. According to Eqs. (7, 8) there are several solutions, rotated with respect to each other with some unitary matrix G^u and G^d, with the property $G^u\, G^{d\dagger} = I$, leading to the same mixing matrix and the same masses of quarks.

Let us present here the results for the two choices of the fourth family quark masses.

- $m^u_4/(\mathrm{MeV}/c^2) = 650\,000$ and $m^d_4/(\mathrm{MeV}/c^2) = 700\,000$.

When making a choice of the mixing matrix from Eq.(9) we get the following two mass matrices

$$M^u = \begin{pmatrix} 203152 & 119831 & -119454 & 205210 \\ 119831 & 221687 & -204506 & 119454 \\ -119454 & -204506 & 189624 & -119829 \\ 205210 & 119454 & -119829 & 208158 \end{pmatrix}, M^d = \begin{pmatrix} 326162 & 88326 & -88301 & 325942 \\ 88326 & 25646 & -25470 & 88337 \\ -88301 & -25470 & 25368 & -88357 \\ 325942 & 88337 & -88357 & 325780 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{12}$$

For the choice of the mixing matrix from Eq.(10) we get the following two mass matrices

$$M^u = \begin{pmatrix} 290786 & 87195 & -98775 & 282859 \\ 87195 & 135305 & -126830 & 82650 \\ -98775 & -126830 & 120524 & -94720 \\ 282859 & 82650 & -94720 & 276006 \end{pmatrix}, M^d = \begin{pmatrix} 324991 & 90331 & -86743 & 325722 \\ 90331 & 26839 & -25670 & 90609 \\ -86743 & -25670 & 24615 & -87056 \\ 325722 & 90609 & -87056 & 326512 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Since signs of the experimental values for the mixing matrix elements are not known, signs in above mass matrices and mixing matrices do not mean a lot.

We notice:

i. The required symmetry, Eq. (6), of both mass matrices is for V_{ud} from Eq. (9) kept to good accuracy: $1.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$. When V_{ud} from Eq. (10) was chosen we were less successful: 0.06.

ii. The matrix elements for the M^u matrix differ in the case of Eq. (9) from one another at most for a factor of ≈ 1.7. They are, in this sense, quite close to the democratic matrix. In the case of Eq. (10) this value is larger, ≈ 3.6

iii. The matrix elements for the M^d matrix differ more than for M^u. In the case of Eq. (9) the greatest factor is almost ≈ 14 , while in the case of Eq. (10) is smaller and comparable with the M^u , almost ≈ 3.7.

iv. All matrices exhibit the two times two sub structure, with a strong off diagonal 2×2 matrices with a similar sub structure.

v. We found several possibilities for mass matrices, some of them with much higher accuracy, $7 \cdot 10^{-6}$. We present this solution, where we take the mixing matrix from Eq.(9)

$$M^u = \begin{pmatrix} 330374 & 12934 & -13050 & 324225 \\ 12934 & 93080 & -86193 & 13050 \\ -13050 & -86193 & 80937 & -12934 \\ 324225 & 13050 & -12934 & 318231 \end{pmatrix}, M^d = \begin{pmatrix} 247218 & 158924 & -158920 & 274245 \\ 158924 & 104201 & -104176 & 158923 \\ -158920 & -104176 & 104261 & -158925 \\ 247245 & 158923 & -158925 & 247277 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{14}$$

One notices that now M^d is much closer to the democratic one than M^u.

- $m_4^u/(\mathrm{MeV}/c^2) = 1000000$ and $m_4^d/(\mathrm{MeV}/c^2) = 1000000$.

$$M^u = \begin{pmatrix} 289964 & 209106 & -204432 & 292708 \\ 209106 & 313501 & -291899 & 209439 \\ -204432 & -291899 & 272809 & -205482 \\ 292708 & 209439 & -205482 & 296346 \end{pmatrix}, M^d = \begin{pmatrix} 465856 & 126384 & -126352 & 465576 \\ 126384 & 36015 & -\ 35837 & 126379 \\ -126352 & -35837 & 35733 & -126391 \\ 465576 & 126379 & -126391 & 465354 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

when the mixing matrix of Eq. (9) was taken.

For the choice of V_{ud} from Eq. (10) we obtain

$$M^u = \begin{pmatrix} 432990 & 1508323 & -168518 & 426744 \\ 150823 & 164863 & -157745 & 146757 \\ -168513 & -157745 & 153321 & -164994 \\ 426744 & 146757 & -164994 & 421448 \end{pmatrix}, M^d = \begin{pmatrix} 457651 & 127608 & -125525 & 464788 \\ 127608 & 37332 & -\ 36562 & 129679 \\ -125525 & -36562 & 35879 & -127606 \\ 464788 & 129679 & -127606 & 472096 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

We notice:

i. The required symmetry of both mass matrices are succeeded for V_{ud} from Eq. (9) to be kept to a quite good accuracy: $7 \cdot 10^{-3}$. When V_{ud} from Eq. (10) was chosen we were much less successful: 0.05.

ii. The matrix elements for the M^u matrix differ in the case of Eq. (9) from one another at most for a factor of $\approx$ 1.4. They are, in this sense, still quite close to the democratic matrix. In the case of Eq. (10) this value is larger, $\approx$ 3

iii. The matrix elements for the M^d matrix differ again more than those of the M^u-matrix. For both choices of V_{ud} the greatest factor is almost $\approx$ 13.

iv. All matrices still exhibit the two times two sub structure, with a strong off diagonal 2×2 matrices of a similar sub structure.

To take into account that mass matrices have matrix elements non real, or even that mass matrices be non Hermitian (experimental data are fitted into complex V_{ub} and V_{td}), one should proceed, as explained in appendix A, by diagonalizing the two Hermitian matrices: $M^{\alpha}\, M^{\alpha\,\dagger}$ and $M^{\alpha\,\dagger}\, M^{\alpha}$.

III. CONCLUSIONS

We make in this paper one step more in proving that the *spin-charge-family* theory might be the right way beyond the *standard model*. We take the symmetries of mass matrices as predicted by this theory for the lowest four families, assuming that loop corrections, which are expected to be highly non adiabatic, do not destroy symmetries of the tree level mass matrices, which are determined by the vacuum expectation values of two kinds of the scalar fields: i. One kind distinguishes only among family members. ii. The second kind distinguishes only among families. The assumption, that loop corrections do not break the starting symmetries, although not proven yet, seems reasonable. Loop corrections can and do considerably change values of the matrix elements, but the symmetries are expected to be kept.

We study in this contribution only quarks. All the results are very preliminary. We take experimental values for the masses of the observed quarks and the measured mixing matrix at the energy scale of the mass of the weak bosons. We require that the orthogonalizing matrices respect the measured matrix elements of the 4×4 orthogonal mixing matrix and rotate the measured masses of fermions into the mass matrices which must fulfil the required symmetries. The masses of the fourth family are taken as free parameters. The results are then not only the mass matrices, but also the fourth family matrix elements in the mixing matrix.

The optimisation procedure leads for several values of the fourth family masses, we present here only two of them, to mass matrices of the required symmetries and with matrix elements which for M_u the largest ratio between the largest and the smallest matrix element is less then 2, while the equivalent ratio for M_d is almost 10 times larger. But we got the rotated solutions, in which M^d is closed to be democratic, while M^u is much less democratic-like.

Mass matrices exhibit a kind of a twice 2×2 sub structure, with the off diagonal matrix elements of quite a similar 2×2 structure. All matrix elements are within at most of one order of magnitude different, supporting the old idea of [8] that mass matrices could be close to the democratic one.

The study is in progress. Our hope is to show that the four families are essentially needed for explaining the spectrum of quarks and leptons.

Appendix A: Properties of non Hermitian mass matrices

This pedagogic presentation of well known properties of non Hermitian matrices can be found in many textbooks, for example [10]. We repeat this topic here only to make our discussions transparent.

Let us take a non Hermitian mass matrix M^α as it follows from the *spin-charge-family* theory, α denotes a family member (index $_\pm$ used in the main text is dropped).

We always can diagonalize a non Hermitian M^α with two unitary matrices, S^α $(S^{\alpha\,\dagger} S^\alpha = I)$

and T^{α} $(T^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,T^{\alpha} = I)$

$$S^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,M^{\alpha}\,T^{\alpha} \;=\; \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{d} = (m^{\alpha}_{1}\ldots m^{\alpha}_{i}\ldots m^{\alpha}_{n}). \tag{A1}$$

The proof is added below.

Changing phases of the basic states, those of the left handed one and those of the right handed one, the new unitary matrices $S'^{\alpha} = F_{\alpha S}S^{\alpha}$ and $T'^{\alpha} = F_{\alpha T}T^{\alpha}$ change the phase of the elements of diagonalized mass matrices $\mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{d}$

$$\begin{aligned} S'^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,M^{\alpha}\,T'^{\alpha} &= F^{\dagger}_{\alpha S}\,\mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{d}\,F_{\alpha T} = \\ &\quad diag(m^{\alpha}_{1}e^{i(\phi^{\alpha S}_{1}-\phi^{\alpha T}_{1})}\ldots m^{\alpha}_{i}\,e^{i(\phi^{\alpha S}_{i}-\phi^{\alpha T}_{i})},\ldots m^{\alpha}_{n}\,e^{i(\phi^{\alpha S}_{n}-\phi^{\alpha T}_{n})})\,, \\ F_{\alpha S} &= diag(e^{-i\phi^{\alpha S}_{1}},\ldots,e^{-i\phi^{\alpha S}_{i}},\ldots,e^{-i\phi^{\alpha S}_{n}})\,, \\ F_{\alpha T} &= diag(e^{-i\phi^{\alpha T}_{1}},\ldots,e^{-i\phi^{\alpha T}_{i}},\ldots,e^{-i\phi^{\alpha T}_{n}})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

In the case that the mass matrix is Hermitian T^{α} can be replaced by S^{α}, but only up to phases originating in the phases of the two basis, the left handed one and the right handed one, since they remain independent.

One can diagonalize the non Hermitian mass matrices in two ways, that is either one diagonalizes $M^{\alpha}M^{\alpha\,\dagger}$ or $M^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha}$

$$\begin{aligned} (S^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha}T^{\alpha})(S^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha}T^{\alpha})^{\dagger} &= S^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha}M^{\alpha\,\dagger}S^{\alpha} = \mathbf{M}^{\alpha 2}_{dS}\,, \\ (S^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha}T^{\alpha})^{\dagger}(S^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha}T^{\alpha}) &= T^{\alpha\dagger}M^{\alpha\,\dagger}M^{\alpha}T^{\alpha} = \mathbf{M}^{\alpha 2}_{dT}\,, \\ \mathbf{M}^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{dS} &= \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dS}\,, \quad \mathbf{M}^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{dT} = \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dT}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

One can prove that $\mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dS} = \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dT}$. The proof proceeds as follows. Let us define two Hermitian $(H^{\alpha}_{S}\,,\,H^{\alpha}_{T})$ and two unitary matrices $(U^{\alpha}_{S}\,,\,H^{\alpha}_{T})$

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\alpha}_{S} &= S^{\alpha}\mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dS}S^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,, \qquad H^{\alpha}_{T} = T^{\alpha}\mathbf{M}^{\alpha\dagger}_{dT}T^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,, \\ U^{\alpha}_{S} &= H^{\alpha\,-1}_{S}M^{\alpha}\,, \qquad U^{\alpha}_{T} = H^{\alpha\,-1}_{T}M^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

It is easy to show that $H^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{S} = H^{\alpha}_{S}$, $H^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{T} = H^{\alpha}_{T}$, $U^{\alpha}_{S}\,U^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{S} = I$ and $U^{\alpha}_{T}\,U^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{T} = I$. Then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} S^{\alpha\dagger}\,H^{\alpha}_{S}\,S^{\alpha} &= \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dS} = \mathbf{M}^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{dS} = S^{\alpha\dagger}\,M^{\alpha}\,U^{\alpha\,-1}_{S}\,S^{\alpha} = S^{\alpha\dagger}\,M^{\alpha}\,T^{\alpha}\,, \\ T^{\alpha\dagger}\,H^{\alpha}_{T}\,T^{\alpha} &= \mathbf{M}^{\alpha}_{dT} = \mathbf{M}^{\alpha\,\dagger}_{dT} = T^{\alpha\dagger}\,M^{\alpha\,\dagger}\,U^{\alpha\,-1}_{T}\,T^{\alpha} = T^{\alpha\dagger}\,M^{\alpha\dagger}\,S^{\alpha}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

where we recognized $U^{\alpha\,-1}_{S}\,S^{\alpha} = T^{\alpha}$ and $U^{\alpha\,-1}_{T}\,T^{\alpha} = S^{\alpha}$. Taking into account Eq. (A2) the starting basis can be chosen so, that all diagonal masses are real and positive.

[1] N.S. Mankoč Borštnik, Phys. Lett. **B 292** (1992) 25, J. Math. Phys. **34** (1993) 3731 Int. J. Theor. Phys. **40** 315 (2001), Modern Phys. Lett. **A 10** (1995) 587, Proceedings of the 13^{th} Lomonosov conference on Elementary Particle Physics in the EVE of LHC, World Scientific, (2009) p. 371-378, hep-ph/0711.4681 p.94, arXiv:0912.4532 p.119.

[2] A. Borštnik, N.S. Mankoč Borštnik, hep-ph/0401043, hep-ph/0401055, hep-ph/0301029, Phys. Rev. **D 74** (2006) 073013, hep-ph/0512062.

[3] N.S. Mankoč Borštnik, http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.5765, http://arXiv:1012.0224, p. 105-130.

[4] N.S. Mankoč Borštnik, "Do we have the explanation for the Higgs and Yukawa couplings of the *standard model*?", in this Proceedings.

[5] d. Lukman, N.S. Mankoč Borštnik, "Families of spinors in $d = (1 + 5)$ with zweibein and two kinds of spin connection fields on an almost S^2", in this Proceedings.

[6] A. Hernandez-Galeana, N.S. Mankoč Borštn "Masses and Mixing matrices of families of quarks and leptons within the Spin-Charge-Family theory, Predictions beyond the tree level", arXiv:1112.4368 p. 105-130, arXiv:1012.0224 p. 166-176.

[7] Z.Z. Xing, H. Zhang, S. Zhou, Phys. Rev. **D 77** (2008) 113016, Particle Physics booklet, July 2012, PDG, APS physics.

[8] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. 73B, 317 (1978); Phys. Lett. 73B, 317 (1978); Nucl. Phys. B155, 189 (1979), Phys. Lett. B 184, 391 (1987); G.C. Branco and D.-D. Wu, ibid. 205, 253 (1988); E. A. Paschos, U. Turke, Phys. Rep. 178, 173 (1989), H. Harari, Y. Nir, Phys. Lett. B 195, 586 (1987); C. H. Albright, Phys. Lett. B246, 451 (1990); C. Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1039 (1985); D.-D. Wu, Phys. Rev. D 33, 860 (1986); Zhi-Zhong Xing, Phys. Rev. **D 48** (1993) 2349.

[9] G. Bregar, M. Breskvar, D. Lukman, N.S. Mankoč Borštnik, hep-ph/0711.4681, New J. of Phys. **10** (2008) 093002, hep-ph/0606159, hep/ph-07082846, hep-ph/0612250, p.25-50.

[10] Ta-Pei Cheng, Ling-Fong Li, *Gauge theory of elementary particles*, Claredon Press Oxford, 1984.

[11] The simple starting action [1–3] in $d = [1 + (d - 1)]$ contains fermions with the two kinds of spin, interacting with the vielbeins $f^{\alpha}{}_{a}$ and the two kinds of the spin connection fields, $\omega_{ab\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{ab\alpha}$, with $\alpha, \beta, \dots$ as the Einstein index and $a, b, \dots$ as the flat index
$S = \int d^dx \, E \, \mathcal{L}_f + \int d^dx \, E \, (\alpha \, R + \tilde{\alpha} \, \tilde{R})$, $\mathcal{L}_f = \frac{1}{2} \, (E \bar{\psi} \, \gamma^a p_{0a} \psi) + h.c.$,
$p_{0a} = f^{\alpha}{}_{a} p_{0\alpha} + \frac{1}{2E} \, \{p_{\alpha}, E f^{\alpha}{}_{a}\}_{-}$,
$p_{0\alpha} = p_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} S^{ab} \omega_{ab\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{S}^{ab} \tilde{\omega}_{ab\alpha}$,
$R = \frac{1}{2} \, \{f^{\alpha[a} f^{\beta b]} \, (\omega_{ab\alpha,\beta} - \omega_{ca\alpha} \, \omega^{c}{}_{b\beta})\} + h.c.$,
$\tilde{R} = \frac{1}{2} \, f^{\alpha[a} f^{\beta b]} \, (\tilde{\omega}_{ab\alpha,\beta} - \tilde{\omega}_{ca\alpha} \tilde{\omega}^{c}{}_{b\beta}) + h.c.$.

[12] One kind of the spin connection fields includes fields gauging S^{ab}, which are determined by the Dirac gammas (γ^a's), another kind gauges $\tilde{S}^{ab}$, determined by the second kind of gammas, $\tilde{\gamma}^a$'s, used in the *spin-charge-family-theory* [1–4] to generate families ([4, 5]).